

**Compilation of
Member Responses to Questionnaire
on ACHP Organization and Member Engagement**

July 6, 2018

Note: Not all respondents answered every question. At the request of some members, responses have been anonymized while still noting whether the respondent was an individual member or a representative of an agency or organization.

I. Business meetings.

The ACHP for many years met on a quarterly basis, but budget constraints a few years ago led to scaling back to three times a year, the current schedule. Meetings are currently a half-day, but in some periods were a full two days. Traditionally the ACHP would meet as often as every other meeting out of DC to address specific issues and engage with local communities. Pages 4-7 of the Operating Procedures pertain to Council meetings.

1. What do you see as the optimum frequency of ACHP business meetings?

- 3 meetings a year. One should be regional on a rotating basis (NW, SW, Midwest, SE) *(Individual 1)*
- Two per year if in person, more if video-conferencing is adopted. *(Individual 2)*
- [Organization 1] also meets three times each year, and that seems adequate. *(Organization 1)*
- 3 meetings/year is good. *(Agency 1)*
- At the very minimum twice a year. *(Agency 2)*
- 3 - 4 meetings/year seems timely in addressing major issues and providing enough frequency to build rapport among the members. *(Organization 2)*
- Four; I think there will be greater need for meetings with a full-time Chair. *(Individual 3)*
- Twice a year. *(Agency 3)*
- Quarterly, at least. *(Individual 4)*
- Optimum frequency would depend on the amount of business that needs to be conducted by the full membership in person. Based on recent experience it appears that twice per year would be sufficient. If the business of the Council increases, then a higher frequency may be warranted. *(Agency 4)*
- Quarterly meetings make sense, but three times a year is easier to schedule. *(Organization 3)*
- Quarterly. *(Organization 4)*
- Twice a year is sufficient unless there are special circumstances that require additional meetings. *(Agency 5)*

- Three meetings per year. (*Individual 5*)
- Current three times per year works well. Greater frequency requires more of a diversion of staff resources away from their regular work. (*Organization 5*)
- Quarterly with the option for email meetings/votes as needed. (*Agency 6*)
- Two times a year is sufficient. (*Agency 7*)
- 3 seems fine. (*Individual 6*)
- It seems that three times per year is about the right tempo for business with sub group or tasking done on interim basis when needed. (*Agency 8*)
- Quarterly meetings may be needed while the new Chairwoman is establishing her direction for the Council and developing a new strategic plan. However, three times a year seems sufficient to address Council business. (*Agency 9*)
- Quarterly with one of the meetings held outside of Washington, DC. (*Individual 7*)
- Three meetings per year. (*Agency 10*)
- 4 times per year. (*Individual 8*)
- Twice a year – Spring and Fall, while Congress is in session. (*Agency 11*)
- Four times a year with one meeting outside DC with special emphasis on local/national issues. It would be nice to have one in cooperation with the NTHP Conference as our fourth outside meeting, but John (and Ralston when he was there) pushes back hard on that happening. And yes, for all the reasons previously stated. Special video-conferencing should also be considered as most of my other organizations do it on a regular basis. Feds can always video in. (*Individual 9*)

2. *How long should they last?*

- The current format is adequate (one-day subcommittee and half day business) (*Individual 1*)
- A day and a half (*Individual 2*)
- 2 days works well. (*Organization 1*)
- I think the current length is good. (*Agency 1*)
- 2 days (*Agency 2*)
- The half-day seems to work. However, the challenge is engaging members in important topics and providing enough time for good discussion. (*Organization 2*)

- The actual business meeting should last three to four hours (what can get done after that length of time?). It should include committee meetings the day before the business meeting. (*Individual 3*)
- One, full day in DC; 1 or 1.5 days if remote to make the trip worthwhile and allow for return travel time. (*Agency 3*)
- One day for committees and one for the meeting. (*Individual 4*)
- Meeting duration also depends on the amount of business to be conducted. (*Agency 4*)
- No more than a day. (*Organization 3*)
- Half-day. (*Organization 4*)
- Four to five hours is sufficient (*Agency 5*)
- ½ day to 1 day depending on agenda (see #6). (*Individual 5*)
- Current length works fine. (*Organization 5*)
- 3 hours. (*Agency 6*)
- Two to three hours. (*Agency 7*)
- Sometimes, I've felt that the half day was too long and sometimes it seems too short, so maybe it's just right. (*Individual 6*)
- Usually the business meetings are the right amount of time. Trying to reduce that time might actually hurt their value because it won't be enough time to complete business. Mostly they are straight through without break. I would keep them about the same amount of time. (*Agency 8*)
- The length should depend on the content of the agenda. Too much of the current meetings doesn't seem substantive. There seems to be limited time allotted for the members to have substantive policy discussions. There should be more "closed" sessions so the Members feel free to have more in depth, open discussions on policy issues, controversial issues, and strategic direction. (*Agency 9*)
- Six hours, (9am-3:00pm) (*Individual 7*)
- One full day, with lunch provided for members (so as not to lose their attention/presence); the longer meeting would enable moving some topics to the full council agenda for robust discussion rather than confining them to committees. For example, the membership of the FAP Committee has always been a struggle, as all FEDS want to be members/participants (all FAP Committee agenda topics typically apply to/interest FEDS). However, this makes the FAP Committee size unmanageable and often dominated by the same cast of characters. Making room on the full ACHP agenda for some typically "FAP topics" would diversify the participants in the discussions and the FAP Committee could be contained to a manageable number of members, without others feeling "left out" of the discussions. (*Agency 10*)

- Beginning on Tuesday afternoon, Wednesday, to allow for members to attend meetings which are currently overlapping. (*Individual 8*)
- The current format works well. (*Agency 11*)
- The current schedule appears to work well, more time to engage the members. Unfortunate that the committees are meeting simultaneously. (*Individual 9*)

3. *Should the ACHP hold out-of-DC business meetings on a regular basis?*

- Yes, at least once a year. (*Individual 1*)
- Yes, absolutely. To inspect critical sites, get closer to the issues, meet key people. (*Individual 2*)
- Yes, and I would be willing to stay over another day for site/project visits. (*Organization 1*)
- I think once per year is about right. They put the members in touch with preservation efforts – people and places- around the country through the related meetings and events in the host city. It's a learning experience for everyone. ACHP staff does a great job of arranging relevant and meaningful experiences for the members in the away meetings. (*Agency 1*)
- Ad Hoc, as needed. (*Agency 2*)
- Absolutely! These meetings provide members the opportunity to see preservation issues up close and hear how their decisions impact local projects. Also, the members are often in attendance for a longer period and have more involvement in the work of the ACHP, fellow members and agencies. (*Organization 2*)
- Yes, but probably not more than once per year. It is difficult for federal members to get away and they are important/essential to our work. Another possibility is to look for other opportunities for presidential appointees to gather (conference, ribbon cutting ceremonies, etc.). We should take advantage of out-of-DC meetings to engage and work with local stakeholders. (*Individual 3*)
- Yes, 1 a year; although ability of agencies to attend will depend upon travel and budget constraints. (*Agency 3*)
- Yes, at least one meeting. (*Individual 4*)
- Yes, this is clearly a useful endeavor; however, it is often a financial challenge for travel-restricted federal agencies. Timing of non-DC meetings should take into account the Federal Fiscal year (i.e. avoid travel late in the FY), and also acknowledge that Federal members ability to receive approval and funding for travel will vary and also be affected by government-wide budget environments. (*Agency 4*)
- At least one meeting a year should be scheduled elsewhere. (*Organization 3*)
- With adequate notice this would be appropriate for at least one meeting per year. Perhaps this meeting could be held in conjunction with a member conference or event. (*Organization 4*)

- Yes; meeting outside of DC allows members to interact in a less formal atmosphere. Additionally, it provides members the opportunity to see areas/meet individuals that may be of special interest to the Council or its members. (*Agency 5*)
- Yes. (*Individual 5*)
- Only if there is a clear benefit or purpose for the off-site meeting, such as hearing local input on a specific issue. Holding meetings outside of DC can be risky, because it could be perceived as a junket. It's also much more costly in terms of both time and money, and attendance is usually lower as a result. (*Organization 5*)
- No. Out-of-DC meetings are a burden to the participating agencies which are predominately located in DC and prevent SME audience participation. (*Agency 6*)
- I don't think so. (*Agency 7*)
- Yes. I would venture to say that if the meeting schedule expanded to 4 meetings, then two should be out of town, if possible. DC is such a bubble and if we don't get out of it, it's hard to really understand some of the issues. Plus, it gives us a chance to meet with the people who are doing preservation work on the ground, every day. We talk in the big picture a lot and we need to break that down so we can see how it actually plays out in real life. (*Individual 6*)
- While many would like this notion and even I would enjoy the change of setting, I think it will actually reduce the possibility of attending by many. With the pace of change in Government and the acceleration of work in the Administration, keeping it in Washington DC likely keeps for better participation. (*Agency 8*)
- It depends on the agenda. Out of town meetings are only helpful if there is a substantive issue that the members need to discuss with local representatives. Most of the Council agenda has no local ties. Seems that these out of town meetings are basically opportunities for "cool tours" rather than substantive issues that advance the requirements of NHPA, which seems like a waste of Federal funds. (*Agency 9*)
- Should hold one meeting each year outside of Washington, DC. (*Individual 7*)
- No. Federal budgets are still too tight to obligate participants to regular travel. That said, occasional out of town meetings, as topics or opportunities arise would be welcome. Any out of town meetings should have a specific purpose tied to the destination, not just for a show of getting out of DC. In addition, full remote participation of members should be made available for any meetings out of DC, as budgets for travel are simply too restrictive to ensure participation in person and member participation needs to be encouraged, not discouraged by logistics. (*Agency 10*)
- Yes, optimally at least once per year. ACHP's effectiveness includes reaching out to communities. A meeting summary and proceedings should be shared on social media, the new format of connecting to constituents. ACHP should not utilize overlap with National Trust conventions, but separate locations where connecting with the Historic Preservation Community is effective. (*Individual 8*)
- No. (*Agency 11*)

- Yes, absolutely! Those are our best meetings where members can meet locals and talk about the real issues of heritage. Twice a year of the four meetings we should meet out and take the ACHP staff along as they do the heavy lifting. (*Individual 9*)

4. Should the ACHP explore videoconferencing or other technologies for business meetings?

- This should be an option, but in-person attendance encouraged. If we needed a fourth meeting, perhaps it could be by conference. (*Individual 1*)
- Yes, for all the reasons one can imagine. (*Individual 2*)
- My [organization] just did this for the first time last Friday. It's awkward, but if the technology can be arranged I think it's worth trying. (*Organization 1*)
- I prefer in-person. (*Agency 1*)
- Yes, as well as webinars focused on special issues. (*Agency 2*)
- I think video conferencing works best for small groups and those who have close working relationships. I don't see that being the case for the ACHP. (*Organization 2*)
- While I think it is important to embrace technology, I worry about how effective it would be considering the size of the Council and many of its committees. (*Individual 3*)
- Yes, this would also allow for increased public access to the ACHP if live-streamed. Use of technology could also be used for shorter meetings between the 2 longer ones, if there were business to conduct. (*Agency 3*)
- No. (*Individual 4*)
- Yes, if ACHP has staff or some other IT support on hand to ensure (to the extent feasible) that such technology will perform as expected and that ACHP staff (or non-ACHP support staff) are on hand and well trained in use and troubleshooting of said technology. (*Agency 4*)
- Yes! (*Organization 3*)
- That would be helpful for those who do not live in the Washington, DC area and are not able to attend each meeting. (*Organization 4*)
- I think it is important that members be present. This allows for more engagement. However, having a videoconference option is useful in case members are unable to attend certain meetings in person. (*Agency 5*)
- No. (*Individual 5*)
- Yes! (*Organization 5*)
- Yes; however, the majority of the meetings should be in-person as they provide a venue for building relationships, sharing experiences, and fostering ingenuity. (*Agency 6*)

- I find them to be disruptive, distracting and often problematic. (*Agency 7*)
- Yes, and similarly to the whole getting-out-of-the-bubble suggestion, this would allow us to open up to more stakeholders. (*Individual 6*)
- They can be used and for those times where a member cannot join in person but could drop in it might be of value. Unfortunately though I think there is a loss of quality of communication and engagement that comes with being in person. (*Agency 8*)
- Only the open Business Meetings. It would be appropriate to bring the Council into the 21st Century. Note: the web site is awful and really needs to be modernized. (*Agency 9*)
- No. All meetings should be in person. (*Individual 7*)
- Yes, always. Realistically, “things” just come up sometimes (think: March snowstorm) and full participation should always be encouraged even when attendance in person is not possible. (*Agency 10*)
- Only if the meeting proceedings are to be posted and shared with the public. Videoconferencing in attendees and presenters to Committee meetings can be added as is business standard. (*Individual 8*)
- Yes – there should be a webinar component, but Board members should attend in-person. (*Agency 11*)
- With large groups always a challenge but it is where things are going due to everyone’s time constraints. Person-to-person is always the best but for some travel is not always that easy, especially from the west coast, Hawaii’, Alaska, or the territories. Some of the monitor technology is rather awesome, after a while you feel as though you are there. (*Individual 9*)

5. *Are there any specific provisions of the Operating Procedures relating to business meetings that you think should be changed?*

- Not presently. (*Individual 1*)
- Not in any substantive way. Are votes by proxy allowed? (*Individual 2*)
- No. (*Organization 1*)
- The meetings are run very efficiently. (*Agency 2*)
- I think the public needs to have an opportunity to be engaged. I would support 30 minutes of public input, with limits on how long any individual could speak. (*Individual 3*)
- III.B. Public Participation and disclosure: If conducting video meetings, a communications methodology will need to be established on how best to inform the public of the meeting and how they can participate via video conferencing.
III.E. Quorum: Clarification would be needed to address if virtual attendance counts for quorum (*Agency 3*)

- NO. (*Individual 4*)
- III.B-Public Participation and Disclosure-video conferencing or other forms of remote meeting participation would be beneficial and in keeping up with technological trends. However, if the ACHP adopts these technologies they should also consider how such technologies would be accessible or could be made accessible for members of the public who wish to attend the Business meeting remotely.
The ACHP should consider making the “meeting book” available electronically to the public ahead of the meeting (except for sections that are deemed “sensitive” for the usual confidentiality reasons).
III.E. Quorum- If ACHP implements some form of remote/electronic participation for its members, then this section of the procedures must delineate how this would impact quorum calculations. (*Agency 4*)
- Not at this time. (*Organization 3*)
- Yes, the council should allow designated staff who may be attending for official designee to vote and to be at the table. They have been given permission to speak by and for the agency and therefore the Council should allow them to be at the Table. (*Agency 5*)
- Consider including the ACHP Foundation as a subgroup. (*Individual 5*)
- No. (*Agency 6*)
- No. (*Agency 7*)
- I really think it’s good to hear from each committee, even if it’s only a brief update. (*Individual 6*)
- For the most part the operating procedures are helpful and professional. I don’t know of any needed changes. (*Agency 8*)
- No comment. (*Agency 9*)
- None suggested at this time. Still considering. (*Individual 7*)
- No. (*Agency 10*)
- 1. Member positions should be filled; can add more structure to membership committee and timeframes 2. Member compensation: review this information with the White House as they had told me to bill up to 100 days/annum. 3. Public Participation: Consideration may be given to utilizing Business Meetings assembly and public attendance as part of a more active Agency public outreach. (*Individual 8*)
- We need a means of addressing the non-participation of Administration officials in the legislative agenda. Administration officials should not be put in the uncomfortable position of having to abstain from comments/votes on ACHP positions that have not been cleared. At a minimum, the agenda could make clear that specific individuals are excused for that portion. (*Agency 11*)

- Invite “controlled” public forums to hear from constituents we don’t regularly engaged. This happens every time we hold a meeting outside DC and it’s refreshing. (*Individual 9*)

6. Do you have any suggestions for structuring the business meeting agenda?

- Encourage more discussion of the issues. (*Individual 1*)
- If the business meetings are the preamble for the public meeting, then we should have a policy “roundup” explaining the critical cases and votes. This is important especially in times of change. (*Individual 2*)
- The agenda seems fine. (*Organization 1*)
- I wish there was more substantive discussions during the business meetings. Most of the work is done through committees – which is great – and allows for more deliberation and in-depth discussions. However, I think it would be valuable and interesting to have at least one topic queued up for greater discussion during the business meeting. (*Agency 1*)
- Current structuring works well. (*Agency 2*)
- It seemed the Twilight tower issue discussed at the recent spring meeting provided good discussion among members. Making sure every meeting has a topic that can provide lively discussion would be good. (*Organization 2*)
- I think that should be left to the Chair. I don’t have any problems with the way meetings have been structured, though there may be better ways. It was helpful to move the awards program to an evening reception. If the awards are to continue, I would recommend continuing having them the night before. (*Individual 3*)
- It would be informative to allow more time for discussions among members on topical issues and deviate from the typical pre-programmed order of business. (*Agency 3*)
- More public interaction, listening sessions on topics raised by the members. (*Individual 4*)
- Yes, the emphasis of the business meeting should be shifted to really take advantage of having the members present and allow much greater time for in depth, meaningful and substantial discussions amongst the members on the current relevant and high level topics such as: Administration priorities, national trends impacting historic preservation, frank discussions of federal agency challenges and group problem-solving, diplomatically sensitive projects, etc. (*Agency 4*)
- Not at this time. (*Organization 3*)
- The current structure works well. (*Agency 5*)
- Consider breaking the Council into smaller discussion groups who will discuss a particular issue, strategy, priority, etc. (*Individual 5*)
- Recommend limiting the number of FYI presentations and focusing on actionable items requiring ACHP attention. (*Agency 6*)

- No. (*Agency 7*)
- I think the agendas for the most part have been a good mix of business and presentations. (*Agency 8*)
- More time for substantive discussion among the members and less time for committee reports. Instead of preparing a “script” for the Committee Chairs to read at the Business meeting, the ACHP staff could prepare a one-page summary to distribute at the beginning of the meeting. This is especially true for “progress report” types of items. If the Committee has a substantive recommendation that requires a decision by the full Council, then it could be added to the agenda. (*Agency 9*)
- Agenda for each meeting should allow for a special presentation by a special guest, i.e., Mayor, Cabinet Secretary, National Civic Leader, etc. (*Individual 7*)
- See answer to Question 2 above. “Ceremonial” activities should be kept to an absolute minimum, as members with busy schedules will be more likely to commit to the full meeting time if the agenda is “substantive”. To the extent possible, awards, recognitions, etc should be held during associated receptions or events rather than as part of the full agenda (unless the award is directly part of the ACHP mission and/or a core program activity). (*Agency 10*)
- Once a year a committee of the whole workshop can convened by the Chair in a workshop setting to discuss national needs, ACHP year- priorities, vision, goals, and principles. The business meeting is a formal reporting event so not appropriate for a working discussion, which can be led by ACHP staff or outside consultants. Can be accomplished in one additional 4 hours session on Tuesday. (*Individual 8*)
- Sometimes there appears to be a convivial tug-of-war between the Chairman and the Executive Director. The speaking roles should be clearly stated, with the Executive Director clearly running the meeting and the Chairman presiding. (*Agency 11*)
- We need much more time for discussion of issues, especially since other members may not be on certain committees and yet wish to weigh in on the topics. Recommend again, box lunch and going to 3:00 PM, working straight on through with ½ hour to eat, drink and be merry. (*Individual 9*)

7. Do you have any other comments or suggestions regarding business meetings and how they might change with the arrival of a full-time Chairman?

- I think the Chairman’s report will need to be a more substantial part of the meeting. We will need to have a good understanding of how they are spending their time. (*Individual 1*)
- I imagine there might be more time for the Chair to share concerns or the specifics of a particular case with the membership. We should allow time for that. (*Individual 2*)
- No. (*Organization 1*)
- A full time Chairman could increase number of meetings and perhaps tailor 1-2 of the 4 quarterly to address emerging issues, hot topics, highlight successes and programs. (*Agency 2*)

- The full-time Chairman should take full advantage of increased direct access to staff, files and equipment to implement any suggested changes, improvements or adjustment to Council specific issues either during the meetings or assign to staff immediately afterwards to address, flattening the organization by eliminating the need to inform the Executive Director who must subsequently delegate the actions to appropriate staff. The full-time Chairman can immediately begin to delegate responses and actions at the meeting and state for the record who and when to create more accountability. In addition, s/he would be best informed of the current workload of the staff and be able to inform the members what realistic responses/outcomes they can expect. *(Agency 3)*
- Not yet, but I am sure there will be ways we can maximize the advantage of a full time Chair. *(Individual 4)*
- Having a full-time Chair introduces opportunities for a very different dynamic between the Chair and Members, as well as between the Chair and the staff of the ACHP. The continuous presence of the Chair at the ACHP offices will allow for a much greater flow of information between Chair-Members-Staff. It will also enable decisions, tasks and assignments to be made and delegated out during business or committee meetings or in preparation for and follow-up from those meetings in a way that will increase the communication flow, and therefore the productivity of the members' time they put to serving on the Council. Greater interaction between members and ACHP staff should be encouraged, as the current model often appears to have staff and members operating and focusing on completely separate issues/topics. *(Agency 4)*
- Not at this time. *(Organization 3)*
- No. *(Agency 5)*
- Perhaps more guest speakers (preservation partners, eg. Civil War Trust) could be invited to speak. *(Individual 5)*
- - Consider using the business meetings as an opportunity to plan an evening reception on the Hill with significant outreach to members of Congress.
- You have removed the question about the use of "unassembled" meetings, but that is a procedure that has been over-utilized in the past and should be kept to an absolute minimum. *(Organization 5)*
- No. *(Agency 6)*
- No. *(Agency 7)*
- The full-time Chairman will be more involved in the regular work of the council and may have a different perspective on the need to review certain issues as part of the business meeting. It will be important to consider the difference between how a FTC experiences the issues vs the PT members. *(Individual 6)*
- One concern I have as a Federal member is when the policies or actions diverge from Administration priorities or agenda. Holding votes make it extremely difficult and cause abstentions. I think when ACHP is going to express a position that is counter to an administration position, perhaps a way can be found to do that, but members that are there are

representing a cabinet member and as such, are going to be holding to position that we know of or seeking advice on positions within the administration. (*Agency 8*)

- None. (*Individual 7*)
- No. (*Agency 10*)
- 1. A new organization chart for ACHP should indicate where the public at large falls under ACHP purview. This may be strengthened via re-boot of a Preserve America type program. What is the intended breakdown of effort?, aka, 30% public citizen property and education programs, 30% Federal Agency Policy engagement; 40% Funding and Legislative Initiatives? Currently more emphasis seems placed on interagency concerns. 2. Meetings tend to be reactory, Federal or representative comments made in response to stated ACHP concern or action. Based on new expectations set by the Chairperson, might there be a shift in content and proceedings? Just wondering what is possible. Federal Members to present examples of best practice collaboration, innovation, sponsoring of interns, funding of initiatives within their agencies, etc. (*Individual 8*)
- With a full-time chair it will offer a much different dynamic relationship between the chair and members, but more importantly with staff. Decisions, tasks and assignments will be made from a policy perspective as supported by the membership to staff that should increase the communications. The chair will also have the time to call members, discuss relevant topics, policies and groom them for more interaction on the council. From [Agency 4]: Greater interaction between members and ACHP staff should be encouraged, as the current model often appears to have staff and members operating and focusing on completely separate issues/topics. Amen! (*Individual 9*)

II. Committees

The core of the current ACHP committee structure (Preservation Initiatives, Communications Education and Outreach, Federal Agency Programs, and Executive) was created in 2001 and expanded to include the Native American Committee in 2011. Previously the ACHP had an occasional standing committee (e.g., legislation) and functioned primarily through task-oriented working groups and task forces. These continue to be used for overseeing development of special projects and reports. The Operating Procedures address “Council Subgroups” on page 3 (a standing Credentials Committee is the only one specified).

1. Is the concept of standing ACHP committees sound or is there a more desirable organizational model?

- We may need to have a standing legislative committee, but our time is pretty stretched right now, but there is a need. Maybe legislative could be added to an existing committee’s responsibility. *(Individual 1)*
- The current model seems viable as we are able to change the committees in the future given a good reason to do so. *(Individual 2)*
- Other organizations I’m involved with use a similar model, and it works. *(Organization 1)*
- Committees work well and is a good structure. *(Agency 1)*
- Based on my [several] years participating and representing [Agency 2] the existing standing model is appropriate. *(Agency 2)*
- Seems the concept of committees allows members & representatives the opportunity to gain more understanding of the workings of the ACHP as well as building collaborations among member organizations. *(Organization 2)*
- I think standing committees are a very sound way of operating. I don’t like when organizations operate solely on a “committee of the whole” model. *(Individual 3)*
- There is significant overlap among committee discussions and reports as they tend to be topic based; the working group/task force approach may be more desirable to encourage cross-discussion while reducing redundancies. As not all topics fit neatly under a single committee, working groups can more easily include the appropriate members. *(Agency 3)*
- Yes, it is sound. *(Individual 4)*
- Standing committees can be a useful way to discuss topics/projects in greater detail than time allows during the business meetings. However, all of the extant committees should be reviewed for possible consolidation/redirection and the Chair, in consultation with the members, should assess if new standing committees are needed to respond to the current Administration’s priorities. There is also often overlap in topics discussed during the current committee meetings, that should be examined to determine if committee time can be more efficiently structured to reduce duplication of effort but encourage collaboration between committees when topics do overlap, perhaps committees could meet jointly on certain issues. *(Agency 4)*

- I think the current organization works, but since I am so new to the group, I may not have the best point of view on this. (*Organization 3*)
- It is a sound model. (*Organization 4*)
- It's sound. (*Agency 5*)
- I believe the concept of standing committees is sound. (*Individual 5*)
- Standing committees is appropriate; however, suggest they meet monthly to establish a consistent rhythm and foster coordination/collaboration amongst participants. This would be particularly valuable for the FAP committee. Recommend clarifying and affirming desired representation in each of the standing committees as they could use a "refresh." (*Agency 6*)
- I think it works fine. (*Agency 7*)
- The committee model seems to work well, but there's definitely some overlap in the areas of consideration. I always wish I could attend the other committees to which I don't belong just because their work seems so interesting. I don't see how that could be managed without expanding the committee work day or giving each committee less time so that there was no overlap in schedule. (*Individual 6*)
- I think it would be a good time to reviewing standing committees and align them better with the Administration. For example infrastructure, jobs, etc., and how does ACHP both carry out its legally mandated mission, and reflect current priorities? (*Agency 8*)
- The Federal Agency Programs Committee spends too much time on updates, but is probably the most widely attended and the most active Committee. I see great value in the Native American Committee, but it is not well attended and could use a more substantive agenda. However, the Committee structure needs to respond the new Chairwoman's agenda for the Council and her strategic visions for the Council. There is always the need to stand up an Ad Hoc working group or task force to address an emerging issues. That capability should be retained. (*Agency 9*)
- Sound. (*Individual 7*)
- It is, but the committee agendas should be pared down, with more substantive discussions brought to the full membership (see answer to Question 2 in Section 1). (*Agency 10*)
- 1. Membership of each committee should be tasked with setting the yearly agenda and then implementing it. Staff can carry some of prior year's agenda, and committees should have a given purpose of identifying needs. Also less agenda emphasis to be placed on Presidential transition periods, ACHP should continue initiatives and continue to work through (my observation of 2 terms). 2. I worked [to develop a Task Force] agenda, which was for Federal Agencies to do case studies of their best practices. It seemed to have good interest and information sharing. (*Individual 8*)
- Yes. Administration initiatives should be addressed through Federal Agency Programs. (*Agency 11*)

- The standing committees work well but the chair may have some other ideals. We only had three standing committees when I started. Having the pleasure of listening to all of the committees there is quite a bit of overlap just due to the nature of preservation and compliance. The committee chairs, full-time chair, ED, and directors should meet on a regular basis to discuss commonalities. *(Individual 9)*

2. *If the committee concept is retained, should the current committee structure be modified?*

- I think that it should be considered. We should see if restructuring is needed to address current demands. *(Individual 1)*
- Not sure, but I feel a set up by which we are in better contact and coordination with the appointed cabinet level reps would be greatly appreciated. *(Individual 2)*
- No, I think these committees make sense. *(Organization 1)*
- You may want to consider expanding to include emerging issues in the current structure. *(Agency 2)*
- It seems it should reflect the organization of the ACHP. If the Chairman changes the organizational structure the committees might realign as well. *(Organization 2)*
- Of the committees, I find Preservation Initiatives to be kind of a catch-all for a variety of issues, which can be somewhat confusing and sometimes overlaps with other committees. Could PIC be better defined? Of the four committees, the CEO Committee mixes operating “stuff” and substantive work. Again, it is bit of a catch-all committee. Should its mission be more tightly defined? The Executive Committee isn’t really used in a traditional sense. Its only regular meeting is before the morning before the business meeting. Is this the best way to use this group? Will the Executive Committee function be more or less important with a full-time Chair? I would advocate for the Executive Committee to meet more regularly between business meetings by phone to be briefed by the Chair on activities she is undertaking. I think this will be important to ensure engagement of presidential appointees. *(Individual 3)*
- Not needed – functional as is. *(Agency 3)*
- No, I feel the committee structure is sound as is. I can see the committees expanding as the full time Chair settles into her position. *(Individual 4)*
- Perhaps; see above. *(Agency 4)*
- It seems to work well as-is. *(Organization 3)*
- I believe the current structure is beneficial. Perhaps with more emphasis on the limited-term, task oriented working group. *(Organization 4)*
- No additional comment. *(Agency 5)*
- Although there is some overlap between CEO and Preservation Initiatives, I would retain both. *(Individual 5)*

- “Preservation Initiatives” should be renamed as “Policy and Legislation” because the current title does not adequately convey the scope of the committee’s work. (*Organization 5*)
- No. (*Agency 6*)
- I don’t think so. (*Agency 7*)
- If so yes... see my last answer. (*Agency 8*)
- The Council members should have some flexibility to pick which Committee they sit on. (*Agency 9*)
- No. (*Individual 7*)
- In the post-Preserve America “boom period”, the Preservation Initiatives committee seems to struggle with a purpose at times. Certainly, the legislative tracking and outreach functions of this office and committee are vital. But other work areas have, at times, felt manufactured to justify the existing office and committee structure. The specific mission and workplan of this office/committee should be evaluated with the new Chairman and consideration should be given to whether the existing structures of both remain valid business models. (For instance, a “sub-committee” for Legislative Affairs could be created as a permanent entity, but with lesser standing than the full committees). (*Agency 10*)
- TBD, think the structure is functional, however scheduling of meetings, possibly adding a committee, and sharpening of the committee focus and intended deliverables. The Outreach Committee should work on fewer focus topics, and the staff should be more people working on general social media feed and creating event outreach. Have young staffers/interns attend on-campus events and forums in conjunction with NPS, NTHP, etc. (*Individual 8*)
- Not yet. (*Agency 11*)

3. *Are there overlaps in committee jurisdiction and subject matter that should be addressed?*

- Probably. (*Individual 1*)
- Good question. I feel some committees [are critically important]. The Native American Comm seems separated and “ghettoized”. Hard to keep up with their concerns and I know how critical they are. (*Individual 2*)
- There will always be some overlap, it’s unavoidable. I don’t see any glaring problems. (*Organization 1*)
- While there is sometimes overlap between the Federal Agency Programs Committee and the Preservation Initiatives Committee it generally is not duplicative. Where there is duplication, an executive decision should be made to assign it to one committee or the other. (*Agency 1*)
- Existing structure is reasonable and efficient. (*Agency 2*)
- PI and CEO committees often are considering similar issues. This could be useful if you expect them to opine on a topic from different directions but often it may be overlap. It does

appear that more preservation legislation is showing up that affects preservation and would be useful to discuss in PI, FAP committees or jointly. (*Organization 2*)

- See above [answer to question 2]. (*Individual 3*)
- Yes, particularly when agency program issues impact tribes – the two committees can tend to talk about the other rather than with each other. (*Agency 3*)
- None that I can see. (*Individual 4*)
- Yes, the Federal Agency Programs committee and the Native Affairs committee often overlap and spend time discussing the same issues from slightly different perspectives. They should remain separate committees as there are topics that come up during the Native Affairs meetings that are inherently specific to tribes, but more could be done in preparation for the committees meeting to communicate agendas and discussion topics to minimize duplication. Partial joint meetings between committees could be beneficial. Discussions of legislative initiatives that directly impact federal agencies to a substantial degree should be effectively addressed in the FAP committee. (*Agency 4*)
- They all seem to overlap to one degree or another, but those overlaps seem to be addressed in the general business meeting agendas, so I don't know that anything should be changed. (*Organization 3*)
- There should be more overlap of FAP and the Native American committee. (*Agency 5*)
- (see [answer to question 2]) Consideration could be given to including Preserve America in CEO Committee. (*Individual 5*)
- It is unclear who are the intended participants and focus of the Native American Affairs committee. It has previously been implied that only Native American representatives are asked to participate; however it would be of extreme benefit to welcome/encourage Federal Agency participants as well. (*Agency 6*)
- I don't think so. (*Agency 7*)
- Yes, there are a lot of overlaps, but I think each committee has a different approach to the issues and maybe it's best to keep things the way they are so that the differing expertise of each committee can be brought to bear on the issues. (*Individual 6*)
- There could be the only one that I have participated on is the Native American committee and it was a hold over. I think a good review and purpose of the committees should be done. (*Agency 8*)
- In the past, there has been some overlap between the Preservation Initiatives and the Federal Agency Programs Committees. Also, there is overlap between the Federal Agency Programs and the Native American Committees. It is appropriate to have these two Committees continue, as long as they do not meet at the same time. (*Agency 9*)
- Subject matter of each committee overlaps in some manner, directly or indirectly. This is to be expected and does not adversely impact the effectiveness of the committees' work. For

instance the efforts of each committee directly or indirectly contribute to ACHP's goal for increasing diversity and youth participation in the preservation movement. (*Individual 7*)

- See answer to question 2 above. If the legislative functions of the Preservation Initiatives Committee were separated out, perhaps other "special projects" handled by that office (reports, studies, etc.) could be rolled into the CEO Committee (or FAP, depending on subject matter). (*Agency 10*)
- Yes, and would be ok for one committee to take jurisdiction as long as membership has access to the meetings. (*Individual 8*)
- Absolutely. The executive committee doesn't really function at all. Hopefully with a full-time chair that will change. It will also increase the commitment time by the volunteer members. Overlap needs to be more controlled for better communication. (*Individual 9*)

4. *Should the current approach to having committee meetings the day before the business meeting and committee conference calls halfway between business meetings be revised? If so, how?*

- I believe the current structure is effective. (*Individual 1*)
- That format seems right, many organizations follow it. It should reduce mistakes and increase comprehension of issues on the part of the members. That said, at each cycle, a short meeting with the Chair and the leadership on key issues would be most welcome. Why are certain votes critical? (*Individual 2*)
- I think it works well the way it is. (*Organization 1*)
- Having the committee prior to the business meetings allows a greater understanding of pressing concerns or issues that can be elevated if need be at the business meeting. (*Agency 2*)
- As a call participant, it's hard to tell if the conference calls accomplish much. Staff might have a sense of what substantive work is done outside of updates which can be handled in other forms of communication. (*Organization 2*)
- I think this works pretty well. (*Individual 3*)
- Too much of the business meeting is spent summarizing the just held committee meetings. It may be more productive to have the business meetings before the committee/working group meetings so that the members can better direct the committees rather than have staff set the agendas for the committees which then sets the agenda for the business meetings leaving members in a reactive rather than proactive position. (*Agency 3*)
- NO. (*Individual 4*)
- Yes. Discussions held during the committee meetings are often rehashed during the business meetings, which is not the best use of members' time. It would be better if the discussion of the Business meeting informed the discussion of the committee meetings--perhaps committees should meet after the Business meeting? The committee conference calls are duplicative of the discussion in the committee meetings. Time should be put into determining how the interim committee calls can become preparations for the committee meetings, rather than duplication of those meetings. (*Agency 4*)

- No. (*Organization 3*)
- I believe this works well. (*Organization 4*)
- The meetings should be structured in a way that allows for optimum participation. Currently, there is overlap in timing that does not allow for participation in all the committees. (*Agency 5*)
- If ½ day meetings, Committee meetings could be in the morning and council meetings in the afternoon. (*Individual 5*)
- Seems fine as is. (*Organization 5*)
- Suggest revising to reoccurring monthly meeting. (*Agency 6*)
- I think it works fine. (*Agency 7*)
- As mentioned above, I actually wish I could go to more of the committee meetings, but because of the schedule, I can't manage that. Maybe having more conference calls and less time for the in person meetings would allow the schedule to be spread out during the in-person dates. (*Individual 6*)
- Depending how committees get modified some of that work could be done in between and in those situations technology may be appropriate to help get it done. (*Agency 8*)
- For the efficient use of out of town members of the Council, it is appropriate to have the Committee meetings the date before the Business meeting. (*Agency 9*)
- No. (*Individual 7*)
- This structure works reasonably well. However, if more substantive discussions were moved to the Business Meeting agenda, perhaps the committee meetings could be shorter. In addition, at least for the FAP Committee, the halfway call is most often only a "reporting out" meeting; little to no substantive discussion occurs. That being the case, a mid-point status update/report (in writing) could be equally effective. (*Agency 10*)
- Have one more day of committee meetings on Tuesday will facilitate getting more work done, perhaps with an increased membership. (*Individual 8*)
- Seems okay except for the overlap of issues. With a full-time chair I believe that can be more efficient and effective. FAP and NAAC need to be joined at the hip since there are so many common issues. (*Individual 9*)

5. *Should the limited-term, task oriented working group system continue to be used? Do you see ways to improve it?*

- We should continue using it. We need to have discussion of their need at the business meetings if possible when the need arises. (*Individual 1*)

- No, this seems to work ok. Assuming we have good direction and access to some resources. (*Individual 2*)
- The system works. There might be times when the working group should be pulled from one of the committees as a subcommittee, but that should be up to the Chair. (*Organization 1*)
- Yes. (*Agency 2*)
- These seem effective, especially when tasks have a short time frame or require more in depth discussions than can be accomplished in a 3 hour committee or full meeting. (*Organization 2*)
- I think this system has been useful and well-used. It is important that these working groups have a well-defined scope and product. An alternative would be to create sub-committees from existing committees, but I am not sure how that would improve the current model. (*Individual 3*)
- Yes; more frequent, short, updates from staff about the group's actions and progress would be useful so that there is less need to spend time recapping those actions before finally getting to full member discussion at the business meetings. (*Agency 3*)
- I think it works well and do not see a need for change. (*Individual 4*)
- Yes. Greater flow of information from ACHP staff to members would help make the task orientated work groups more productive and allow work groups to respond to current issues/topics more quickly and effectively. (*Agency 4*)
- I don't have enough experience to comment on this. (*Organization 3*)
- This system should continue. (*Organization 4*)
- Recommend continuation of the working groups. [Agency 5] experience has been good when involved. (*Agency 5*)
- I would continue to use this system. (*Individual 5*)
- The working groups have been very useful for developing approaches to substantive issues such as Federal Property disposal ("Reduce the Footprint"), Native American/Hawaiian affairs, Telecommunications, Archaeology, Preservation Covenants, "Rightsizing," Post Offices, Renewable Energy, Army Corps Appendix C regulations, Diversity, Defense Dep't programmatic approaches, etc. However, the groups are fairly ad hoc, with the title "working group" and "task force" used interchangeably, and with no centralized way to find outcomes such as reports or guidance developed by the groups, or to find a list of which working groups/task forces are still in effect, and which ACHP members are a part of the group. (*Organization 5*)
- Yes this system should remain in place. It would be of great benefit for the community to know which working groups are currently formed so others may become involved as time/interest permit. Currently there is no easy way of tracking the working groups or their progress. (*Agency 6*)
- It works great to get things done. (*Agency 7*)

- I think if the standing committees are reviewed and changed, term limited groups should be few and have specific charges and outcomes. If they do not reach those outcomes actively extend or terminate them. *(Agency 8)*
- There is always a need to stand up Ad Hoc workgroups or task forces to address emerging, limited time issues. However, there needs to be defined end points – a specific deliverable or a set end date. *(Agency 9)*
- Yes for their continuation. No suggestions for improvement at this time. *(Individual 7)*
- It should. However, it seems that the full membership is not always kept up to speed (on a regular basis) on the work handled in these groups. As a result, there have been times when the final “product” (report, recommendation, policy) comes to the full membership and they are not as prepared or comfortable acting as they should be. Obviously, this can delay action and frustrate the staff and work group members who have been intimately involved and feel that the product is ripe for adoption/conclusion. *(Agency 10)*
- Think these are effective. How are topics chosen? Can each group have staff and intern to ensure a certain progress? *(Individual 8)*
- Each business meeting should confirm that the groups are engaged on priority tasks and not spending inordinate time/resources on lower priorities. *(Agency 11)*
- Maybe, I always get complains about re-hashing committee work the day before, and yet when other committee reports are given, those members are engaged. Again, full engagement is important and the committee chairs need to work closer together with the full-time chair and staff. *(Individual 9)*

6. *Do you have any other comments or suggestions regarding committees and subgroups and how they might change with the arrival of a full-time Chairman?*

- The full-time Chairman should continue outreach to the citizen appointees on issues facing the preservation community. *(Individual 1)*
- None. *(Individual 2)*
- If there isn't a technology working group there probably should be, to address social media, web design, etc. ACHP deals every day with exciting subject matter, but the agency's website and electronic communications couldn't be more boring. *(Organization 1)*
- I am pleased with the arrival of a full-time Chairman and believe it will provide increased continuity and transparency for the ACHP. *(Agency 2)*
- It seems the Chairman may have priorities or approaches that should be considered that will provide insights into how & what the committees cover. *(Organization 2)*
- After gaining an understanding of the workload and capacity of staff, the new Chairman will be able to evaluate the effectiveness of committees and sub-groups and determine appropriate work group compositions and deadlines. *(Agency 3)*

- No. (*Individual 4*)
- Recommend a holistic assessment of how the primary information exchange points (i.e. Business meeting, committee meetings, interim conference calls and work groups) communicate and inform each other towards the larger goals, mission and strategic plan of ACHP. Additional time should be spent evaluating the best way to integrate ACHP staff into the communication flow to ensure they are providing the most up-to-date information to members and, in turn, receiving timely guidance from members. (*Agency 4*)
- Not at this time. (*Organization 3*)
- No. (*Agency 5*)
- As stated earlier, the ACHP [Foundation] could be a subgroup or perhaps even a committee. I would also consider having a dinner the night before the meeting with a speaker or special guest. (*Individual 5*)
- No. (*Agency 6*)
- No. (*Agency 7*)
- I could see that the full-time Chairman might wish to implement additional committees or reduce some. At the risk of sounding incoherently bureaucratic, I might suggest a “task force on committees” to help guide any changes in the structure. (*Individual 6*)
- I do wonder how the work of ACHP both respects the organic act of its creation as well as reflect key aspects of the administration’s priorities on a constructive way. (*Agency 8*)
- Nothing specific. (*Agency 9*)
- None at this time. (*Individual 7*)
- No. (*Agency 10*)
- The new Chairperson should convene a committee of the whole WORKSHOP to discuss next 50 years ACHP priorities. Committees should be organized per priorities. There was overlap in BAMIPP particularly between communications and PI. Believe there is a tendency to discuss issues per definition of Committees. This results in “Preserve America”, citizen focused efforts, be harder to administer and therefore easily falls through the cracks. Federal Programs is very interesting but more can be done to stimulate Federal participants to stronger action, perhaps by setting up expectations/goals for each year to accomplish. (*Individual 8*)
- I’d like to figure out why it has been so difficult for me to keep engaged with the Federal Agency Programs committee work. I rely on direct contacts with Reid instead. (*Agency 11*)
- As with most organizations with a full-time leader there should be an initial outreach to the members, staff and the public at large to gain a better understanding of what ACHP does best and those challenges of preservation. Too much emphasis is placed on process rather than preservation as the final outcome. (*Individual 9*)

III. Miscellaneous

1. *The Executive Committee currently comprises the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, the four committee chairs, and a policy-level federal agency member. It meets in person just before ACHP business meetings and occasionally by conference call. The members are also consulted periodically to advise the Chairman on specific issues. In recent times, the federal agency seat on the Executive Committee has been vacant, due to lack of policy-level appointees in the designated agency (Interior). On rare occasion, the Executive Committee has taken formal action on behalf of the membership, but its role has been primarily advisory to the Chairman.*

a. Should the Executive Committee be formalized in the Operating Procedures with a specific delineation of its powers and procedures?

- Yes. (Individual 1)
- No opinion, need to know more. (Individual 2)
- Sounds like a good idea. (Organization 1)
- Yes, more specificity and clarity would be good to improve the understanding of the operations. (Agency 1)
- Yes. This ensures consistency. (Agency 2)
- If it works, leave it alone. (Organization 2)
- Yes. See above – I believe the Executive Committee is going to become more important. (Individual 3)
- Yes. (Agency 3)
- Possibly, I am on the fence with this. It can be good to have structure at the Executive Committee level but I have served on many and can say from experience that it can work with or without formalized roles and responsibilities at the Executive Committee level. (Individual 4)
- Yes. (Agency 4)
- I think this is a good idea. (Organization 3)
- Yes. (Organization 4)
- Yes, it is unclear the role and responsibility of the Committee. (Agency 5)
- Yes. (Individual 5)
- That would be a good idea. (Organization 5)
- No. As stated above, this group often lacks Federal Agency representation. (Agency 6)
- Seems appropriate to me. (Agency 7)

- I think this would be a good discussion to have with the full council. I wouldn't mind seeing it formalized, if only to clear up b,c, and d. (*Individual 6*)
- Yes. (*Agency 8*)
- Yes. If this group is the "lost stop" between the Committees and the Chairwoman and/or the Business meeting, there authorities should be cleared documented and agreed to by all of the Council members. (*Agency 9*)
- Yes. (*Individual 7*)
- Not sure. This is probably a good idea, but that said, if it hasn't been a problem in the past, why go looking for a solution? (*Agency 10*)
- Yes. (*Individual 8*)
- Yes. (*Agency 11*)
- Absolutely, it is the main policy advisor and needs to assume a much stronger role working with the full-time chair. (*Individual 9*)

b. Should the Executive Committee be authorized to take formal actions on behalf of the full membership?

- Only limited actions. (*Individual 1*)
- Need to know more. (*Individual 2*)
- Only on a case-by-case basis, with advance authority from the full membership. (*Organization 1*)
- I don't know this is a good idea. (*Agency 1*)
- Yes. (*Agency 2*)
- I don't think so - that could weaken agency involvement in the overall decisions of the ACHP. Given that the ACHP can and does advise President & Congress, all should be involved in the advice. (*Organization 2*)
- Only in very limited circumstances as the unassembled meetings seem to work pretty well. In fact, I can't think of a circumstance in which the Executive Committee would need to act on behalf of the membership. (*Individual 3*)
- Yes. (*Agency 3*)
- Yes, they must be, BUT, only in situations where there is no way for the full membership to meet and discuss the action. There must be clear evidence that the action was needed and it could not wait for a vote from the membership. (*Individual 4*)
- Yes. (*Agency 4*)

- Maybe... but only in instances where the full membership can't be timely consulted. (*Organization 3*)
- No, it is important that the full membership be involved in all voting. (*Agency 5*)
- No. It should make recommendations to the full membership which will then consider at the Council Meeting. (*Individual 5*)
- Rarely, if ever. (*Organization 5*)
- No. As stated above, this group often lacks Federal Agency representation. (*Agency 6*)
- Needs discussion...probably not. (*Agency 7*)
- Possibly this could be part of the formalized operating procedures that emerge after discussion. (*Individual 6*)
- In agreed upon and defined circumstances. (*Agency 8*)
- No. That would take authority away from the Presidentially-appointed Council members and members appointed by the heads of Agencies (Departments). (*Agency 9*)
- No. Should adopt recommendations that would be presented to the Council membership for approval. (*Individual 7*)
- Perhaps, but only in very limited circumstances (such as action needed to advance an initiative in a time of a declared emergency). (*Agency 10*)
- No. (*Individual 8*)
- Limited and case-by-case basis. (*Individual 9*)

c. Should the size or mix of members be changed?

- Not necessarily. (*Individual 1*)
- Need to know more (*Individual 2*)
- No. (*Organization 1*)
- Maintain a quorum. (*Agency 2*)
- If it works, leave it alone. (*Organization 2*)
- There should be more diversity of gender on the Executive Committee. It would be great if we could find an appropriate federal member. (*Individual 3*)
- To be determined after a decision is made on current committee organization. (*Agency 3*)

- 6 is a good number. If changes are proposed, a clear minimum number (6 is fine) should be established. (*Individual 4*)
- This should be analyzed after committee organization has been evaluated. (*Agency 4*)
- I don't think so. (*Organization 3*)
- Yes, it should be periodically changed to engage all members. (*Agency 5*)
- Yes, I would consider adding Executive Director to the EC roster and perhaps a representative of the ACHP Foundation. (*Individual 5*)
- It would be useful to have more members who do not represent specific federal agencies, since voting can be stymied if the federal agency members need to abstain. (Obviously this would require correction by Congress.) (*Organization 5*)
- No comment. (*Agency 6*)
- I don't think so. (*Agency 7*)
- I think the size is probably very workable. (*Individual 6*)
- Yes at least in part, perhaps the federal member. (*Agency 8*)
- There should be a more robust participation representing the Federal agencies. The new Chairwoman should make a concerted effort to ensure a senior DOI representative fully participates. Also, the Executive Committee should be accountable to the full Council membership – what did they discuss? What did they decide? (*Agency 9*)
- No. (*Individual 7*)
- No. (*Agency 10*)
- I think there should be more citizen members like myself, representing more areas of the country, demographic, types of preservation interests, etc. (*Individual 8*)
- Having a PAS Chairman will help, but I think you need key agencies represented at policy-level positions. (*Agency 11*)
- No, it changes from time to time anyway. (*Individual 9*)

d. Should the Executive Committee have a set meeting schedule or meet as needed (or both)?

- Both, but I do not want to see the greater Council compromised. We should only deal with emergency, personnel and budget issues that we determine, through deliberation cannot be handled at a business meeting. (*Individual 1*)
- Need to know more. (*Individual 2*)
- Both. (*Organization 1*)

- Suggest a set meeting to formalize and consider as hoc when issues or concerns arise. *(Agency 2)*
- Make changes as you see them needed, otherwise, if it works, leave it alone. *(Organization 2)*
- It should have a set meeting schedule. *(Individual 3)*
- Only as needed. *(Agency 3)*
- At least before every meeting, as is the practice now. Now that we have a full time Chair, I am fine to have a conference call monthly if the Chair feels that will help. *(Individual 4)*
- New chair and Executive Director should have the most input into analyzing this issue. *(Agency 4)*
- I think a set meeting schedule is wise. *(Organization 3)*
- Set schedule would be beneficial. *(Organization 4)*
- Yes, and that schedule and agenda should be known by the members. A read out/debrief of the meeting should be provided to the full members at the subsequent business meeting. *(Agency 5)*
- Both. I recommend the EC meet every other month. *(Individual 5)*
- No comment. *(Agency 6)*
- No, ad hoc is fine. *(Agency 7)*
- Both. *(Individual 6)*
- I think the executive committee should have some type of regular meetings at intervals appropriate with ad hoc meetings based on need and urgency. *(Agency 8)*
- It will depend on how the new Chairwoman envisions the role of the Executive Committee and how they will be accountable to the full Council membership. *(Agency 9)*
- Both. *(Individual 7)*
- Both. It seems other members may not know/understand what the EC does. By regularizing the schedule and reporting out to the full membership, the function of the EC would be clarified. *(Agency 10)*
- Both. *(Individual 8)*
- Both. *(Agency 11)*
- A set meeting schedule. *(Individual 9)*

2. *The established ACHP procedure is to seat principals and primary policy-level designees at ACHP business meetings. Such members are also entitled to participate in committee meetings, but policy-level representatives of federal agencies rarely do. Is this a problem that requires attention and, if so, how might it be addressed? (Membership credentials are found in Appendix A of the Operating Procedures, pages 13-14)*

- I think that we need to have the new Chairman recruit them for the committee meetings, especially when they believe they would be helpful. (*Individual 1*)
- This is a vexing flaw in the way we do business: we do not get to know our colleagues in the federal agencies, they remain separate, their motivations generally mysterious and their cooperation ranges from uncertain to non-existent. What a waste! They hold untold power and authority not to mention responsibility over vast resources and they are allowed to hide behind their appointments and abstain ad nauseam. What can be done? Can a new chair engage? Should we be having more shared projects or goal oriented programs? Why don't we work together with these people? (*Individual 2*)
- That's a complicated question. Although direct participation might be nice, I think we get more active and candid participation from the appointees, so I guess I would say to leave it alone. (*Organization 1*)
- No, this isn't a problem for my agency. I think that it is appropriate to have working members for the federal agency with greater depth of knowledge and expertise participate at the committee level – staff report and involve principals and policy-level designees on a regular basis. (*Agency 1*)
- Not for [Agency 2]. (*Agency 2*)
- Perhaps as important as whether principal shows up is that every agency assigned to a committee sends an active participant. The value of out-of-DC meetings is principals often engage in the committee meetings. (*Organization 2*)
- Committee meetings are more informational than action oriented. At best, PIC operates by consensus. It has been a good forum to vet some issues, particularly related to legislation. I don't think there is a realistic way to get policy-level reps to attend committee meetings. We probably need to do more to engage those agency people who do attend the committee meetings prior to the meetings so they can get feedback from their agency. (*Individual 3*)
- Unlikely to be able to get more time from policy-level designees. Having more discussion among members at the business meetings that then guided committee / work group actions would address the goal of having policy-level input. (*Agency 3*)
- No. (*Individual 4*)
- Given the demands on agency policy-level designees, it is unlikely they can commit to regular attendance of ACHP meetings. The more practical and beneficial approach is to ensure that those who are designated alternates for the policy-level designees are truly qualified, meet the requirements of member representation and are at a high enough level within their own agencies to comprehensively speak to that agency's policies/mission and how it relates to the Administration's priorities/focus. (*Agency 4*)

- I think policy-level designees should attend the committee meetings. In my limited experience, this seems to be where some of the most important discussion takes place. (*Organization 3*)
- Yes, it is a problem. As previously mention above, the council should allow designated staff who may be attending for official designee to vote and to be at the table. They have been given permission to speak by and for the agency and therefore the Council should allow them to be at the Table. (*Agency 5*)
- I am not sure if this is a problem or not, and will defer to members who have more experience with this issue. (*Individual 5*)
- Having staff-level representation in committee meetings is preferable, because the long-term professional staff are typically much more knowledgeable, and their recommendations to the Council as a whole would be less politicized. (*Organization 5*)
- No. (*Agency 6*)
- It is problematic because the committee members sometimes have questions about policy matters that cannot be answered fully by the agency representatives. It may be that the policy-level representatives could be invited for specific discussions on a case-by-case basis. (*Individual 6*)
- Remember that Federal agency representatives work for the administration and represent a cabinet level official. They are not on the ACHP representing their own views although their own experience may help inform or illuminate. So where federal member are required it must be understood what is needed for them to be fully supportive of the work. They cannot freelance based on individual needs or interests. Also, I have attended the committee meetings and when on balance with many pressing needs and competing serious priorities, I have made choices to skip because the meeting tended to be chatty and unfocused rather than dialogue on a specific question that would become a proposal or something that needed disposition. Candidly, I could not tell my presence made a difference at the meeting and with expectations I must meet, I have to seriously triage my time. So more focus, well formed questions and facilitation would likely help attendance. (*Agency 8*)
- There are two problems. First, is the time needed to participate in both the Committee meetings and the Business meetings. For very senior political appointees, their schedules are too full to allow them to be away from the office for almost 2 full days. Second, the agendas really do not have substantive enough agendas that will engage these senior leaders. The level of issues discussed at the Committee meetings are really “action officer” level discussions. The Business meetings are a lot of “talking at” the members and reporting of non-Federal policy issues. If you want senior leaders, you need to have agenda items that involve decisions that impact how those senior leaders perform their jobs. (*Agency 9*)
- Council members who are appointed to the standing committees should be encouraged to attend the committee meetings. In this regard, the importance of the Committees’ work should be discussed at a business meeting with the aim of generating increased interest and participation on part of the principals. Should underscore that any member of the Council is welcome to attend the committee meetings. (*Individual 7*)

- Yes and No! In times when fewer “principals” were participatory, the work still was done. That said, the days when high-level principals were actively involved were highly successful at elevating the ACHP’s profile and legitimizing its very existence. Getting very practical, hands-on work done by the principals is hard, time-consuming and stressful for the supporting staff of all (frankly). But the reward is in credibility and visibility. *(Agency 10)*
- Not sure there is a better way to address this; ACHP can provide position guide including expected attendance. *(Individual 8)*
- This is a problem. The PAS Chairman will need to establish personal connections with policy-level designees to ensure full participation, and that the needs of participants (e.g., respect for their time) are met. *(Agency 11)*
- This has always been a problem because ACHP does not exert itself as being important in governmental policies. Who really cares what we think as a federal agency? To expect a secretary to attend our meetings on a regular basis is ludicrous. On the other hand, they would be brief as they are walking in the door and probably wouldn’t add much to the meeting. They certainly would not attend the committee meeting the day before. So, if the agency is committed, active, participates and knows the issues it is probably the best we can do. *(Individual 9)*

3. *The Delegation of Authority found in Appendix B of the Operating Procedures (pages 16-24) allocates specific responsibilities of the Section 106 regulations among the members, the Chairman, and the Executive Director (ACHP staff). Often ACHP members have an interest in an ongoing Section 106 review, but their participation needs to be consistent with their role as the ultimate decision-makers in the event of a termination and must also conform to ethics and conflicts of interest standards. Current guidelines for member involvement in cases that are pending before the staff or the Chairman are found on page 11. Do these need to be modified?*

- I am not sure. I do believe that the Exec Director, Chair and member roles need more clarification in light of the full time chair coming on. *(Individual 1)*
- Frankly, I had trouble understanding the guidelines, so they could probably use some work. *(Organization 1)*
- If it works, leave it alone. *(Organization 2)*
- More needs to be done to alert members of Section 106 cases in their geographic area. This would be helpful because the member may (or is likely to) have a perspective on the consulting parties and the issues surrounding the 106 review. I think there are ways to do this without sending every notification about a 106 case to every member. I still find it difficult to understand why I have to initiate contact with staff about high profile cases in [my city]. *(Individual 3)*
- Indicate that if three members request a case be considered, the Councilman needs to determine if there are any conflicts of interest before proceeding with a membership meeting. If any of the requestors has a conflict, then it shouldn’t proceed until there are three members who are unbiased and comply with the no conflict standards. *(Agency 3)*
- No. *(Individual 4)*

- Yes. This section would benefit from greater detail and explanation of the steps or scenarios of when members should be involved in detailed discussions of Section 106 cases. The process of how the Chair notifies members of a case review should also be revised to provide greater clarity for the process and intent of the following statement: “If three members so request within 7 days of receiving such notice, the Chairman shall schedule the case for consideration by the membership at a meeting.” (Agency 4)
- I don’t think so. (Organization 3)
- Not at this time. (Agency 5)
- I do not think so. (Individual 5)
- No. (Agency 6)
- I’m not able to make a recommendation but I do understand that ethics and conflicts must be properly handled. It likely would mean a good legal review and working with OGE to assess need for change. (Agency 8)
- I don’t know enough to weigh in on this issue. (Agency 9)
- No. (Individual 7)
- Not sure. (Agency 10)
- Item B: more than 7 days may be more effective unless there is pre-discussion by membership. While some members may be very aware of cases, it would be beneficial for ACHP staff to provide a summary if this is not already done. I remember cases where Reid provided this, but not sure how consistent, as not aware we have had many 109 Cases in recent years. (Individual 8)
- I need to understand more about how this has been practiced. Let’s discuss. (Agency 11)
- Yes, there needs to be more clarity on the process. Members should be informed on critical or controversial public cases so they are aware. Members should also participate in cases, working closely with the full-time chair and staff. It is important to not allow members to be the point or offer personal opinions not representative of the council at large in their appeared membership role. (Individual 9)

4. *The Operating Procedures on page 9 prescribe some methods of communication from the Executive Director to the members. Additionally, the members receive reports from committee meetings and conference calls. Do these need to be revised, with consideration given to the arrival of a full-time Chairman or any modifications in the role of the Executive Committee? If so, how?*

- Yes, the full-time chair needs to be involved in these communications. (Individual 1)
- I would suggest a review of the operating policies, the Chair may want to have access to members of the committee separately from the staff of the ACHP. (Individual 2)
- The Chair should initiate communications with the membership on matters directly affecting the membership such as changes to committees, formation of subgroups, personnel issues

related to agency management, etc. Otherwise, the current provisions are adequate. (*Organization 1*)

- Please continue the updates and reports. This ensures transparency and keeps members informed. (*Agency 2*)
- As indicated above, I believe there has to be more regular communication between the Chair and members between meetings. I think this is a necessary change as more substantive work is going to be undertaken by a full-time Chair. (*Individual 3*)
- The Notification of Council Activities and Monthly Report should now be provided by the Chairman. (*Agency 3*)
- The addition of the full time Chair will likely lead to some changes in communication protocols for the ED. I would like to see it those protocols reviewed after 6 months. Any suggested changes prior to that would be premature. (*Individual 4*)
- It would seem so in response to the addition of the full-time Chair, yet no specific recommendations on how. The style, length and format of all reports or notifications from the Chair or Executive Director should be reviewed holistically with an eye to increasing information flow and creating a communication protocol that maximizes information exchange. (*Agency 4*)
- I don't think so. (*Organization 3*)
- Not at this time. (*Agency 5*)
- I do not think they need to be revised. (*Individual 5*)
- Yes, request more frequent communication. (*Agency 6*)
- For whatever reason, I seemed to have to work hard to get meeting materials. My assistant would only get the basic agenda, meeting time and location and the board note book would go to someone else that I still do not know. It may be helpful to get those electronically in advance if possible. It could be I'm the only one with the problem but something to consider. (*Agency 8*)
- Support current communications practices. However, recognizing the critical importance of internal communications to ACHP continued success, this is a functional area in which the new chair may wish to review/consider early on. (*Individual 7*)
- Too much "communication" gets tuned out....especially when cultural resource issues are not a high priority for the principal. However, most regular communication comes from the ED or staff. With a full time Chairman, a higher level of regular interaction needs to be established with the appointees/principals. How does CEQ do this? Perhaps they have a model to emulate (in parts). (*Agency 10*)
- As appropriate information to be posted on new ACHP website. (*Individual 8*)
- The Executive Director has remarkable communication skills. (*Agency 11*)

- Once the chair arrives I am sure there will be changes. I see the Chair taking over many of the ED's duties now working with the members, as she should. Updates, reports of ACHP activities, personnel issues and the like will be the responsibility of the chair as directed to staff, including the ED. (*Individual 9*)

5. Do you have any other comments or suggestions on the ACHP organization and relationships among the members, the full-time Chairman, and the staff?

- Not at this time. (*Individual 1*)
- I've been through several new chair appointments over the past decade in my own [organization], and I know how disruptive this can be. Each chair brings their own perspective and has a specific area of expertise that then becomes a priority for the agency. This can be a good thing, or not. The ED has the most frequent contact with the chair, and so ends up having to be the primary "trainer". But that's complicated because the ED answers to the chair. It's important for the ED (and the chair) to know that the membership is there to provide guidance and support when necessary, and should help to focus the chair's attention if the chair gets out of sync with the organization. And it's very important for the membership to set an example for the chair with respect to how we communicate with each other, and how good service on the part of staff is recognized. I had a chair whose only public comments about the staff tended to be about how we can all do better, if we aren't growing we're dying, silo mentality is wasteful, etc. It was demoralizing. There are better ways to spur improvements, and the membership needs to watch for those opportunities and provide positive reinforcement. (*Organization 1*)
- The ACHP organization is well organized, the staff is always available to respond to questions. The past [several] years representing [Agency 2] has been a rewarding experience, has increased my knowledge and passion for Historic Preservation. You provide an excellent service to the Federal government. Thank you! (*Agency 2*)
- With a full-time chairman in DC, it seems there are opportunities to build more rapport among the members. (*Organization 2*)
- I am wondering about the appropriate staff structure with a full-time Chair, particularly as it relates to the Executive Director position. Does the ED position become more like a Chief of Staff/Chief Operating Officer? This is probably the direction it should take, but I don't know what typically occurs in the federal government in circumstances like this. (*Individual 3*)
- No. (*Individual 4*)
- The appointment of the ACHP's first full-time, Senate confirmed Chair is a significant opportunity to revisit all aspects of how the ACHP operates, communicates and how the Chairman, Members and staff can most effectively work as a team to affect national preservation policy while maintaining a strong relationship informing Congress and the Administration. (*Agency 4*)
- None at this time. (*Organization 3*)
- No. (*Agency 5*)

- I recommend the full time Chairman make the objectives of the CEO Committee a priority and seek new opportunities for outreach. (*Individual 5*)
- No. (*Agency 6*)
- No. (*Agency 7*)
- It might be good to have further discussion of these questions in person at the next meeting. I recognize that the point of asking now is to help prepare for the arrival of the Chairman, but there will definitely be structural questions that arise after the Chairman is in place. And, the questions about the committees might be easily discussed by everyone, possibly at lunch during the committee meeting day. Or not. I could see that maybe it would be best to get everything packaged up neatly to present to the incoming Chairman. (*Individual 6*)
- Some of my comments are critical, but please understand I have great admiration for ACHP and its role in this country. It has a critical role and one I respect greatly. (*Agency 8*)
- Two thoughts:
 1. That the Chair in making recommendations for future Presidential appointments to the Council, give careful consideration to candidates representing the nation's cultural and geographical diversity.
 2. That the Chair continue and fully support the Chairman's Award and the joint ACHP/HUD Award. (The presentation of these two awards for possible greater visibility might be presented during a business meeting. The CEO committee will review this option and provide a recommendation. (*Individual 7*))
- One thought on a delicate subject: Chairman interaction with staff on a daily basis. The small agency size, coupled with the professional camaraderie of the staff makes ACHP a unique place to work. In many ways, it is like a big (and at times dysfunctional!) family. That comfortable, casual interaction can, however, add an element of "answering to many masters" for the staff. With a full time Chair present in the office daily, I can imagine that could intensify. This could especially be true as the Chairman "learns the ropes" and may seek information/assistance from any ready/willing source (and a number of the staff are highly knowledgeable and eager to share). Without appearing to censor information or contact, I imagine that "managing" information flow and input will be a delicate (and necessary) task. (*Agency 10*)
- Believe under leadership of Chr. Donaldson, the organization, initiatives have been both very cooperative and functional. At this transition and juncture of 50 years of the Preservation Program, believe organizational consultants may be useful to assess what the ACHP opportunities are to accomplish goals, then to reorganize to most effectively accomplish the new directions for the next generation. This may affect how the budget is organized, types of initiatives endeavored. (*Individual 8*)
- I'm concerned about succession planning at ACHP. (*Agency 11*)
- This will be an incredible time for ACHP with a full-time chair. Her leadership will be paramount in the federal government and hopefully, raise ACHP to the proper level of respect and awareness from the general public. ACHP can do much more as an agency in working closely with the Administration, Congress as well as our preservation partners on a grand national scale for the preservation of our collective heritage. (*Individual 9*)